arXiv:1501.04669v2 [math.AP] 7 Apr 2016

Abstract

We consider a scattering map that arises in the $\bar{\partial}$ approach to the scattering theory for the Davey-Stewartson II equation and show that the map is an invertible map between certain weighted L^2 Sobolev spaces.

Action of a scattering map on weighted Sobolev spaces in the plane

R.M. Brown[*]
Department of Mathematics
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506-0027, USA

K.A. Ott[†]
Department of Mathematics
Bates College
Lewiston, ME 04240, USA

P.A. Perry [‡]
Department of Mathematics
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506-0027, USA

1 Introduction

This note considers a map $\mathcal{R}$ that arises in the scattering theory for a first-order system (1.1) in the plane. The map $\mathcal{R}$ takes a potential q to scattering data that appears as a coefficient in the asymptotic expansion of solutions to the first-order system. The map $\mathcal{R}$ also arises in the so-called $\bar{\partial}$ approach to scattering theory for the Davey-Stewartson II equation. The scattering transform we discuss below first arose in work of Fokas and Ablowitz [FA84] as a transformation to convert one of the Davey-Stewartson equations to a linear evolution equation. This same transform also proved to be useful in the work of Brown and Uhlmann [BU97] and Barceló, Barceló and Ruiz [BBR01] who investigated the inverse conductivity problem with less regular coefficients in planar domains.

The formal theory and the beginning of a rigorous treatment of the scattering transform may be found in work of Fokas and Ablowitz [FA84] and Beals and Coifman [BC88]. One remarkable feature of Beals and Coifman is that the map $\mathcal{R}$ satisfies a

---

[*] Russell Brown is partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#195075).

[†] Katharine Ott is partially supported by a grant from the U.S. National Science Foundation, DMS 1201104.

[‡] Peter Perry is partially supported by a grant from U.S. National Science Foundation, DMS 1208778.

Plancherel identity,

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}} |q|^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbf{C}} |\mathcal{R}(q)|^2 \, dk,$$

at least for potentials q that are sufficiently regular. Since the map $\mathcal{R}$ is not linear, this identity does not imply the continuity of the map $\mathcal{R}$ or even that $\mathcal{R}(q)$ is defined for all q in L^2. There are several authors who have established continuity of the transform on other spaces. Sung [Sun94a, Sun94b, Sun94c] develops estimates for the scattering transform in the Schwartz space. Brown [Bro01] establishes that the map $\mathcal{R}$ is continuous in a neighborhood of the origin in L^2. Perry [Per] considers the map on a weighted Sobolev space $H^{1,1}$ and shows that $\mathcal{R}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous on this space. The weighted Sobolev spaces $H^{\alpha,\beta}$ are defined as

$$H^{\alpha,\beta} = \{f : \langle D \rangle^\alpha f \in L^2 \text{ and } \langle \cdot \rangle^\beta f \in L^2\}.$$

We use $\langle x \rangle$ to denote $\langle x \rangle = (1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}$ and then $\langle D \rangle^\beta$ is the Fourier multiplier operator $\langle D \rangle^\beta f = (\langle \cdot \rangle^\beta \hat{f})\check{}$. Astala, Faraco, and Rogers [AFR15] consider the map $\mathcal{R}$ on the space $H^{\alpha,\alpha}$ with $\alpha > 0$ and show that $\mathcal{R} : H^{\alpha,\alpha} \to L^2$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. The main result of the current work is to show that $\mathcal{R} : H^{\alpha,\beta} \to H^{\beta,\alpha}$ when $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$ and that the map $\mathcal{R}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. We also give a result which shows that in the spaces $H^{\alpha,\beta}$, the difference $\mathcal{R}(q) - \hat{q}$ is better behaved than $\hat{q}$. In particular, if q is in $H^{\alpha,\beta}$, then $\mathcal{R}(q) - \hat{q}$ will lie in $H^{2\beta,2\alpha}$, at least for $\alpha, \beta < 1/2$.

Our result in this paper is a two-dimensional analogue of the results of X. Zhou [Zho98] which give mapping properties of a scattering transform for the ZS-AKNS system on weighted Sobolev spaces on the real line.

We begin our development by sketching the definition of the map $\mathcal{R}$. We let q be a function on the complex plane and for much of the argument we will assume that q is in the Schwartz class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{C})$. We will establish estimates on the map $\mathcal{R}$ with constants that depend only on the norm of q in a weighted Sobolev space. With these estimates it will be possible to extend the map $\mathcal{R}$ from the Schwartz space to $H^{\alpha,\beta}$ with $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. Throughout the paper, we will use $e_k(x) = e_x(k) = \exp(\bar{k}\bar{x} - kx)$. We consider the system

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\partial}\mu_1(x,k) = \dfrac{1}{2} e_k(x) q(x) \bar{\mu}_2(x,k) \\ \bar{\partial}\mu_2(x,k) = \dfrac{1}{2} e_k(x) q(x) \bar{\mu}_1(x,k) \\ \lim\limits_{|x|\to\infty} (\mu_1(x,k), \mu_2(x,k)) = (1,0). \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Above, $\bar{\partial} = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2})$ and $\partial = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2})$ denote the standard derivatives with respect to the complex variables $\bar{x}$ and x. When we need to differentiate with respect to k and $\bar{k}$, we will write $\partial/\partial k$ and $\partial/\partial \bar{k}$.

We define our scattering transform $\mathcal{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{R}(q)(k) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbf{C}} e_k(x) q(x) \bar{\mu}_1(x,k) \, dx.$$

Since the function μ_1 approaches one at infinity, it is plausible that $\mathcal{R}$ is a non-linear generalization of the Fourier transform. To make this more precise, we introduce a variant of the Fourier transform that we will use throughout the paper. For a function ψ in L^1, we define our Fourier transform by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}(k) &= \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} e_k(x)\psi(x)\,dx\\ &= \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} e^{-2i(k_1x_2+k_2x_1)}\psi(x)\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

From the second expression it is clear how our Fourier transform is related to more common normalizations of the Fourier transform. With our definition, the Fourier transform is the linearization at 0 of the scattering transform. For convenience, we list several standard properties of the Fourier transform translated to our normalization. If we put

$$\check{u}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} e_k(-x)u(k)\,dk,$$

the Fourier inversion formula reads

$$\check{\hat{u}} = \hat{\check{u}} = u,$$

at least for u in the Schwartz class. If we let $f * g$ denote the convolution, we have that

$$(f * g)\hat{\ }(k) = \pi\hat{f}(k)\hat{g}(k) \tag{1.2}$$

and

$$(fg)\hat{\ }(k) = \frac{1}{\pi}(\hat{f} * \hat{g})(k). \tag{1.3}$$

We recall that the Cauchy transform, $\mathcal{C}$, defined by

$$\mathcal{C}f(x) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} \frac{f(y)}{x-y}\,dy$$

gives a right inverse to the operator $\bar{\partial}$. Using that $\widehat{(\bar{\partial}f)}(k) = \bar{k}\hat{f}(k)$, $\widehat{(\partial f)}(k) = -k\hat{f}(k)$ and the representation of $\bar{\partial}^{-1}$ and a similar representation of ∂^{-1}, we obtain that $(1/z)\hat{\ } = 1/\bar{k}$ and $(1/\bar{z})\hat{\ } = -1/k$. From these observations, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} \frac{e_k(y)q(y)}{\bar{y}-\bar{x}}\,dy = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} \frac{\hat{q}(\ell)e_x(k-\ell)}{k-\ell}\,d\ell \tag{1.4}$$

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} \frac{e_k(-y)\bar{q}(y)}{y-x}\,dy = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} \frac{\hat{\bar{q}}(\ell)e_x(\ell-k)}{\bar{k}-\bar{\ell}}\,d\ell. \tag{1.5}$$

These formulae will be used in section 3 below.

We are ready to outline the construction of the solutions of the system (1.1). We let T_k be the operator given by

$$T_k f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{C}(e_k(\cdot)q\bar{f})(x)$$

where q is the potential. Throughout this paper, we assume that q is in the Schwartz class in order to simplify the argument. As a last step, we will use the local Lipschitz continuity of $\mathcal{R}$ from $H^{\alpha,\beta}$ to $H^{\beta,\alpha}$ to extend the map to a weighted Sobolev space. It is clear that if q is in $H^{\alpha,\beta}$ with $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, μ_1 and μ_2 are in $L^\infty(\mathbf{C}^2)$ and are solutions of the integral equations

$$\mu_1 = 1 + T_k(\mu_2) \tag{1.6}$$
$$\mu_2 = T_k(\mu_1) \tag{1.7}$$

then (μ_1, μ_2) are solutions of (1.1). Furthermore, if we substitute (1.7) into (1.6) we obtain

$$\mu_1 = 1 + T_k^2(\mu_1) \tag{1.8}$$

and if μ_1 is a solution of (1.8), then $(\mu_1, T_k(\mu_1)) = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is a solution of (1.1).

Finally, we observe that the map $\mathcal{R}$ is invertible and the inverse map $\mathcal{I}$ can be given by

$$\mathcal{I}(f) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(\bar{f})}. \tag{1.9}$$

The invertibility of $\mathcal{R}$ on the Schwartz space is in the work of Sung [Sun94a, Sun94b, Sun94c] and Perry [Per] gives invertibility on $H^{1,1}$. The estimates of this paper will allow us to extend the invertibility to the family of spaces $H^{\alpha,\beta}$. The formula (1.9) can be found in the work of Astala, Faraco, and Rogers [AFR15] and Perry.

Our main result is the following theorem which gives the properties of the scattering map.

Theorem 1.10 *The map $\mathcal{R}$ maps $H^{\alpha,\beta}$ to $H^{\beta,\alpha}$ and is locally Lipschitz continuous, provided* $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$.

More precisely, if we fix α and β in $(0,1)$, *then there exists an increasing function in M_0, $C = C(M_0) = C(M_0, \alpha, \beta)$ so that if $\|q\|_{H^{\alpha,\beta}} \le M_0$ and $\|q'\|_{H^{\alpha,\beta}} \le M_0$ then*

$$\|\mathcal{R}(q) - \mathcal{R}(q')\|_{H^{\beta,\alpha}} \le C\|q - q'\|_{H^{\alpha,\beta}}.$$

In addition, if α, β are in the interval $(0, 1/2)$, *then*

$$\|\mathcal{R}(q) - \hat{q}\|_{H^{2\beta,2\alpha}} \le C(M_0), \qquad \textit{if } \|q\|_{H^{\alpha,\beta}} \le M_0.$$

Thanks to the identity (1.9), the same results hold for the inverse scattering map.

We begin the proof of Theorem 1.10 by iterating the integral equation (1.8) for μ_1 to obtain finite expansions for μ_1,

$$\mu_1(x,k) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} T_k^{2j}(1)(x) + T_k^{2N}(\mu_1)(x), \qquad N = 1, 2, 3, \ldots. \tag{1.11}$$

We substitute this expression for μ_1 into the definition of $\mathcal{R}(q)$ to obtain

$$\mathcal{R}(q)(k) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} r_j(k) + r^{(N)}(k), \qquad N = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, \tag{1.12}$$

where

$$r_j(k) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y) e_k(y) \bar{T}_k^{2j}(1)(y)\, dy \tag{1.13}$$

and the remainder term is given by

$$r^{(N)}(k) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y) e_k(y) \bar{T}_k^{2N}(\mu_1(\cdot, k))(y)\, dy. \tag{1.14}$$

The notation $\bar{T}_k^{2N}(f)$ is ambiguous and we intend $\bar{T}_k^{2N}(f)$ to mean the complex conjugate of $T_k^{2N}(f)$, $\bar{T}_k^{2N}(f) = \overline{(T_k^{2N}(f))}$.

The term $r_0 = \hat{q}$ is just the Fourier transform. We will use duality and estimates for certain Brascamp-Lieb forms to estimate the terms r_j for $j \geq 1$. For N sufficiently large (depending on α and β) we will be able to show that the remainder term is in $H^{1,1}$. This second step is where we require that α and β be positive, while the estimates for the terms r_j hold for $\alpha = 0$ or $\beta = 0$. The estimates in L^2 can be found in the work of one of the authors [Bro01]. Work of Nie [NB11] and M. Christ's appendix to Perry's paper [Per] give different proofs of these estimates for the terms r_j.

Our argument follows the argument of Perry when the potentials are in $H^{1,1}$. The innovations in this paper are new estimates for multi-linear forms and a certain amount of persistence that is needed to estimate the remainder term.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we give more details on the construction of the special solutions (μ_1, μ_2). In section 3, we prove the estimates for the multi-linear forms in (1.13) and in section 4, we study the remainder term (1.14).

Acknowledgment. We thank K. Astala, D. Faraco, and K. Rogers for showing us a preliminary version of their work [AFR15]. This was helpful in carrying the research reported below. In particular, their decay estimate (2.5) below is a main step in our work.

2 Constructing the scattering solutions

In this section, we collect several estimates that will be needed in section 4 and give a construction of the solutions (μ_1, μ_2) to the equations (1.1).

Much of our analysis will take place in L^p-spaces and we begin by observing that for $\beta > 0$ and $1 > \alpha > 0$, we have the inclusion

$$H^{\alpha,\beta} \subset L^p, \qquad \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{2}. \tag{2.1}$$

The estimate for $p > 2$ follows from the Sobolev embedding theorem and the estimate for $p < 2$ follows from the inequality of Hölder. We let I_1 denote the fractional integral given by

$$I_1(f)(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbf{C}} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|}\, dy.$$

For estimates involving the size of $\mathcal{C}(f)$, the elementary inequality $|\mathcal{C}(f)(x)| \leq I_1(|f|)(x)$ means that it is sufficient to give estimates for $I_1(f)$. For $p \neq 2$, it is well-known (see Vekua [Vek62]) that

$$\|I_1(f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_p \|f\|_{L^p}^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^{p'}}^{1/2}. \tag{2.2}$$

Above, p' is the usual conjugate exponent. We recall the well-known Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev estimate for fractional integration which may be found in [Ste70], for example. If $1 < p < 2$, we have

$$\|I_1(f)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \leq C_p \|f\|_{L^p}, \qquad \frac{1}{\tilde{p}} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}. \tag{2.3}$$

We will find it useful to work in the weighted L^p-spaces, $L^p_\alpha = \{f : \langle\cdot\rangle^\alpha f \in L^p\}$. Occasionally, we will also use the scale-invariant or homogeneous version of these spaces $\dot{L}^p_\alpha = \{f : |\cdot|^\alpha f \in L^p\}$. For $1 < p \leq \tilde{p} < \infty$ and α, β satisfying $-\frac{2}{\tilde{p}} < \beta \leq \alpha < \frac{2}{p'}$, and $\frac{1}{\tilde{p}} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1-\alpha+\beta}{2}$, we have

$$\|I_1(f)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}_\beta} \leq C(p, \tilde{p}, \alpha, \beta) \|f\|_{L^p_\alpha}. \tag{2.4}$$

The estimate (2.4) follows easily from the work of Sawyer and Wheeden [SW92, Theorem 1]. The corresponding estimate in the homogeneous spaces $\dot{L}^p_\alpha$ is due to Stein and Weiss [SW58]. Finally, we recall a result of Astala, Faraco and Rogers who show that for $\alpha \geq 0$ and $2 < \tilde{p} < \infty$, we have

$$\|T_k^2(f)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \leq C \langle k \rangle^{-\alpha} \|q\|^2_{H^{\alpha,0}} \|f\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}. \tag{2.5}$$

Occasionally in the sequel, we will want to display the dependence of T_k and μ_j on the potential q. We will do this by writing $\mu_j(q;\cdot,\cdot)$ and $T_{k,q}$.

Proposition 2.6 *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and suppose that $q \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$. Fix $\tilde{p}_0$ with $1/\tilde{p}_0 \in (0, \epsilon/2)$. We may construct solutions (μ_1, μ_2) of (1.1) with $(\mu_1 - 1, \mu_2)$ in $L^\infty_k(L^{\tilde{p}_0}_x(\mathbf{C}^2))$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $C = C(M_0)$ so that if $\|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \leq M_0$ and $\|q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \leq M_0$, then*

$$\sup_k \|\mu_1(q;\cdot,k) - \mu_1(q';\cdot,k)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}_0}} \leq C(M_0)\|q - q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}.$$

Proof. We may assume that $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. From Hölder's inequality and the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality (2.3) it follows that if q is in L^2 and $\tilde{p}$ is in $(2,\infty)$, the map $f \to T_k f$ is bounded on $L^{\tilde{p}}$ and we have the continuity result

$$\|T_{k,q}(f) - T_{k,q'}(f)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \le C\|q - q'\|_{L^2}\|f\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}.$$

Furthermore, by approximating q in L^2 by functions that are bounded and compactly supported, we can see that the map T_k is compact on $L^{\tilde{p}}$. If we also have that $\langle \cdot \rangle^\theta q \in L^2$, then

$$\|T_{k,q} - T_{k',q}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\tilde{p}})} \le C|k-k'|^\theta \|q\|_{H^{0,\theta}}, \qquad \tilde{p} \in (2,\infty). \tag{2.7}$$

To establish (2.7), observe that

$$|e_k(y) - e_{k'}(y)| \le 2^\theta |k-k'|^\theta |y|^\theta$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} |T_k(f)(x) - T_{k'}(f)(x)| &\le \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} \frac{|f(y)||q(y)|}{|x-y|}|e_k(y) - e_{k'}(y)|\,dy \\ &\le C|k-k'|^\theta I_1(|\cdot|^\theta |q||f|)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by the inequality of Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev (2.3) and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\|T_k(f) - T_{k'}(f)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \le C|k-k'|^\theta \|f\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}\|q\|_{H^{0,\theta}}.$$

In the argument below, we will apply this estimate with $\theta = \epsilon/2$.

We observe that a solution of (1.1) should also solve the integral equations (1.8). According to a standard argument using the Liouville theorem for pseudo-analytic functions (see [BU97, Section 3] or [Sun94a]), the operator $(I - T_k^2)$ is injective on $L^{\tilde{p}}$ for $2 < \tilde{p} < \infty$. Since T_k^2 is compact, the Fredholm theory tells us that $(I - T_k^2)^{-1}$ exists as an operator in $\mathcal{L}(L^{\tilde{p}})$. The continuity of the map $(k,q) \to T_{k,q}$ implies that $\|(I - T_{k,q}^2)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\tilde{p}})}$ is a continuous function for (k,q) in $\mathbf{C} \times H^{0,\epsilon/2}$. According to the decay estimate of [AFR15] (restated as (2.5)), given M_0, we may find R_0 so that $\|T_k^2\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\tilde{p}})} \le 1/2$ if $|k| \ge R_0$ and $\|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \le M_0$. The embedding $H^{\epsilon,\epsilon} \subset H^{0,\epsilon/2}$ is compact and thus the continuous function $\|(I - T_k^2)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\tilde{p}})}$ will be bounded on the compact set, $\{(k,q) : |k| < R_0, \|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \le M_0\} \subset \mathbf{C} \times H^{0,\epsilon/2}$.

If we use the embedding of $H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$, (2.1), and (2.3) we can see that $T_k(1)$ lies in $L^\infty_k(L^{\tilde{p}_0}_x)$. Thus we may set

$$\mu_1(\cdot,k) = 1 + (I - T_k^2)^{-1}(T_k(1)), \qquad \mu_2(\cdot,k) = T_k(\mu_1)$$

and then (μ_1, μ_2) is a solution of (1.1).

Next we observe that thanks to the continuity of the map $(k,q) \to T_{k,q}(1)$ from $H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ into $L^{\tilde{p}_0}$, it follows that the map $q \to \mu_1(q;\cdot,k) - 1$ is continuous from $H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ into $L^{\tilde{p}_0}$. In fact, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1(q;\cdot,k) &- \mu_1(q';\cdot,k) \\ &= (I - T^2_{k,q})^{-1}(T^2_{k,q} - T^2_{k,q'})(1) + ((I - T^2_{k,q})^{-1} - (I - T^2_{k,q'})^{-1})(T_{k,q'}(1)),\end{aligned}$$

and conclude that

$$\|\mu_1(q;\cdot,k) - \mu_1(q';\cdot,k)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}_0}} \le C(R_0)\|q - q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}, \quad \text{if } \|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \le M_0 \text{ and } \|q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \le M_0.$$

∎

Now that we have μ_1 with $\mu_1 - 1 \in L^\infty_k(L^{\tilde{p}_0})$, our next step is to show that we have $\mu_1 - 1$ in an interval of $L^{\tilde{p}}$ spaces. However, before we do this, we give a simple lemma that will be used to obtain the local Lipschitz continuity of multi-linear expressions.

Lemma 2.8 *Let $\Lambda : X_0 \times X_1 \times \cdots \times X_N \to Y$ be a bounded multi-linear operator with X_j and Y normed vector spaces. More precisely, assume that for some constant C_0, we have*

$$|\Lambda(q_1, \ldots, q_N)| \le C_0 \prod_{j=1}^N \|q_j\|_{X_j}.$$

Then we obtain the following local Lipschitz continuity result. If $\|q_j\|_{X_j} \le M_0$ and $\|q'_j\|_{X_j} \le M_0$, $j = 1, \ldots, N$, then

$$\|\Lambda(q_1, \ldots, q_N) - \Lambda(q'_1, \ldots, q'_N)\|_Y \le C_0 M_0^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \|q_j - q'_j\|_{X_j}.$$

Proof. We write

$$\Lambda(q_1, \ldots, q_N) - \Lambda(q'_1, \ldots, q'_N) = \sum_{j=1}^N \Lambda(q_1, \ldots, q_{i-1}, q_i - q'_i, q'_{i+1}, \ldots, q'_N)$$

and use the boundedness of Λ. ∎

Proposition 2.9 *Let ϵ lie in the interval $(0,1)$. If $q, q' \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ with $\|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \le M_0$ and $\|q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \le M_0$, then $(\mu_1 - 1) \in L^{\tilde{p}}$ when $1/\tilde{p}$ in $[0,\epsilon) \cap [0,1/2)$ and*

$$\|\mu_1(q;\cdot,k) - \mu_1(q';\cdot,k)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \le C(M_0,\tilde{p})\|q - q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}.$$

Proof. Let $\mu_1 = \mu_1(q; \cdot, \cdot)$. We have $\mu_1 - 1 \in L^{\tilde{p}_0}$ with $\tilde{p}_0$ as in Proposition 2.6 and then (1.8) implies that $\mu_1 - 1 = T_k^2(\mu_1 - 1) + T_k^2(1)$. Since $H^{\epsilon,\epsilon} \subset L^p$, for $1/p \in [1/2 - \epsilon/2, 1/2 + \epsilon/2)$, it follows from the inequalities of Hölder and Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev (2.3) that $T_k^2(\mu_1 - 1) \in L^{\tilde{p}}$ for $1/\tilde{p} \in (0, \epsilon + 1/\tilde{p}_0) \cap (0, 1/2)$, $T_k^2(1) \in L^{\tilde{p}}$ for $1/\tilde{p} \in (0, \epsilon)$ and we have the estimates

$$\|T_k^2(\mu_1 - 1)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \leq C\|q\|^2_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \|\mu_1 - 1\|_{L^{\tilde{p}_0}}, \qquad \|T_k^2(1)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \leq C\|q\|^2_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}. \tag{2.10}$$

Thus $\mu_1 - 1 \in L^{\tilde{p}}$ for $1/\tilde{p} \in (0, \epsilon)$. Similar considerations and the estimate (2.2) give that μ_1 is bounded.

Once we recognize that $T_k^2(f)$ is a multi-linear expression in q and f, the estimate for the differences follows from (2.10), Proposition 2.6, and Lemma 2.8. ∎

3 Brascamp-Lieb Forms

We consider a family of Brascamp-Lieb forms. A criterion for the finiteness of these forms on families of L^p-spaces was given by Barthe [Bar98, Proposition 3] and simpler proofs of his criterion were given by Carlen, Lieb, and Loss [CLL04, Theorem 4.2] and Bennett, Carbery, Christ, and Tao [BCCT10, Remark 2.1]. We note that Barthe and Carlen, Lieb, and Loss also give information about the best constant in these inequalities. We are not able to make use of this information in our work. A simple approach to the finiteness of these forms can be found in the dissertation of Z. Nie, see [NB11] (and may be well-known).

To describe the forms we will consider, fix N and let $E \subset \mathbf{R}^{N+1}$ be a finite collection of non-zero vectors. The set E carries the structure of a matroid (see [Lee04] for the definition). Using E, we will define a closed convex subset of $\mathbf{R}^{N+1}$ which is called the matroid polytope for E. We denote elements of $[0, 1]^E$ as functions $\theta : E \to [0, 1]$. If $A \subset E$ is a set, then we let χ_A be the indicator function of the set A. Thus

$$\chi_A(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & v \in A \\ 0, & v \notin A. \end{cases}$$

The *matroid polytope* of E, $\mathcal{P}(E)$, is defined to be the convex hull of the set $\{\chi_B : B \subset E \text{ and } B \text{ is a basis for } \mathbf{R}^{N+1}\}$. Given a set of vectors E, we define a multi-linear form

$$\Lambda(f_v | v \in E) = \int_{\mathbf{C}^{N+1}} \prod_{v \in E} f_v(v \cdot x)\, dx$$

where $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_N)$ is a point in $\mathbf{C}^{N+1}$ and $v \cdot x = \sum_{i=0}^N v_i x_i$ is the standard bilinear inner product. We initially assume that the functions f_v are non-negative so that the integral defining $\Lambda(f_v | v \in E)$ will exist, though it may be infinite. The estimates of Theorem 3.1 will give us estimates for the form when the functions $\{f_v : v \in E\}$ belong to certain Lorentz spaces. These estimates will allow us to extend the form to appropriate products of Lorentz spaces.

We will need to consider these forms when the functions f_v are in Lorentz spaces $L^{p,r}(\mathbf{C})$, $1 \leq p, r \leq \infty$, and refer the reader to the monograph of Bergh and Löfström for the definition of these spaces[BL76, p. 8]. Our main estimate for Brascamp-Lieb forms is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose that the function* $(1/p_v)_{v\in E}$ *lies in the interior of the set* $\mathcal{P}(E_1)$ *and* $\sum_{v\in E} 1/r_v \geq 1$. *Then there is a finite constant* C *such that*

$$\Lambda(f_v|v \in E) \leq C \prod_{v\in E} \|f_v\|_{L^{p_v,r_v}}.$$

Proof. As noted above, this is essentially a result of Barthe. To connect our statement to the result of Barthe, we first observe that the finiteness of the form on $\mathbf{C}^{N+1}$ is equivalent to the finiteness of the form on $\mathbf{R}^{N+1}$, *i.e.* the form obtained when $x \in \mathbf{R}^{N+1}$ instead of $\mathbf{C}^{N+1}$. This follows from the theorem of Fubini.

Next we observe that Barthe gives a description of the family of L^p-spaces for which the form is finite in terms of a family of inequalities satisfied by the reciprocals, $(1/p_v)_{v\in E}$. It is known that the inequalities of Barthe describe the matroid polytope, see the excellent monograph of J. Lee [Lee04], for example. Finally, a multi-linear version of the real method of interpolation allows us to pass from L^p estimates in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ to Lorentz space estimates in the interior of $\mathcal{P}(E)$. See work of Christ [Chr85] or Janson [Jan86] for the multi-linear interpolation results. ∎

We will need to consider two sets of vectors in this section. The first we will denote by $E_1 \subset \mathbf{R}^{N+1}$ for $N \geq 2$ and is given by

$$E_1 = E_1^{N+1} = \{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_N, e_0 - e_1, \dots, e_{N-1} - e_N, \zeta = \sum_{j=0}^{N} (-1)^j e_j\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Note that the condition $N \geq 2$ guarantees that E_1 contains $2N + 2$ distinct vectors. The second set of vectors will only be needed in odd dimensions. We define $E_2 \subset \mathbf{R}^{2N+1}$, for $N \geq 1$ by

$$\begin{aligned} &E_2 = E_2^{2N+1} = \\ &\quad \{e_0, e_1, \dots e_{2N}, \sum_{j=0}^{2k-1} (-1)^j e_j, \sum_{j=0}^{2k-1} (-1)^j e_{2N-j}, k = 1, \dots, N, \zeta = \sum_{j=0}^{2N} (-1)^j e_j\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

The following lemma shows that the constant function $\theta(v) = 1/2$ lies in the interior of the matroid polytopes for E_1 and E_2.

Lemma 3.4 *For* $j = 1$ *or* 2, *let* $A_{N+1} = \{\theta : \sum_{v\in E_j} |\theta(v) - 1/2| \leq 1,\ \sum_{v\in E_j} \theta(v) = N + 1\}$. *Then* $A_{N+1} \subset \mathcal{P}(E_1)$ *for* $N = 2, 3, \dots$ *and* $A_{2N+1} \subset \mathcal{P}(E_2)$ *for* $N = 1, 2, \dots$.

See Appendix A for the proof.

Our main goal for this section is to establish estimates for the following two forms,

$$\Lambda_1(q_0,\dots,q_N,t)=\int_{\mathbf{C}^{N+1}}\frac{q_0(x_0)\dots q_N(x_N)t(\zeta\cdot x)}{|x_0-x_1|\dots|x_{N-1}-x_N|}\,dx$$

and

$$\Lambda_2(q_0,\dots,q_{2N},t)=$$
$$\int_{\mathbf{C}^{2N+1}}\frac{q_0(x_0)\dots q_{2N}(x_{2N})t(\zeta\cdot x)}{|x_0-x_1|\dots|x_0-x_1\dots-x_{2N-1}||x_{2N}-x_{2N-1}|\cdots|x_{2N}-x_{2N-1}\dots-x_1|}\,dx.$$

The next lemma gives several estimates for these forms that are the main step in obtaining estimates for the terms r_j in the expansion (1.12) of the scattering map.

Lemma 3.5 *Suppose* $0\le\alpha<1$. *The following estimates for the forms* Λ_1 *and* Λ_2 *hold:*

$$\Lambda_1(q_0,\dots,q_{2N},t)\le C\|t\|_{H^{0,-\alpha}}\prod_{j=0}^{2N}\|q_j\|_{H^{0,\alpha/(N+1)}},\qquad N\ge1 \tag{3.6}$$

$$\Lambda_1(q_0,\dots,q_N,t)\le C\|t\|_{L^2}\prod_{j=0}^{N}\|q_j\|_{L^2},\qquad N\ge2 \tag{3.7}$$

$$\Lambda_2(q_0,\dots,q_{2N},t)\le C\|t\|_{H^{0,-\alpha}}\prod_{j=0}^{2N}\|q_j\|_{H^{0,\alpha/(N+1)}},\qquad N\ge1. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. We begin by proving the estimate (3.6) for the form Λ_1. We start with the elementary observation that for $0\le\alpha\le1$, we have

$$1\le\frac{|x_0|^\alpha+\sum_{j=1}^N|x_{2j-1}-x_{2j}|^\alpha}{|x_0-x_1+\cdots+x_{2N}|^\alpha}.$$

To establish a relation between Λ_1 and $\Lambda(f_v|v\in E_1)$, we define f_v^k for $k=0,\dots,N$ and $v\in E_1$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
&f^0_{e_0}=|\cdot|^\alpha|q_0| && \\
&f^k_{e_j}=|q_j|, && (j,k)\ne(0,0)\\
&f^k_{e_{2k-1}-e_{2k}}=1/|\cdot|^{1-\alpha}, && k=1,\dots,N\\
&f^k_{e_{j-1}-e_j}=1/|\cdot|, && j\ne2k\\
&f^k_\zeta=t/|\cdot|^\alpha, && k=0,\dots,N.
\end{aligned}$$

With these definitions we have

$$|\Lambda_1(q_0,\ldots,q_{2N},t)| \le \sum_{k=0}^{N} \Lambda(f_v^k|v\in E_1). \tag{3.9}$$

Apply Theorem 3.1 to the first term in the sum on the right-hand side of (3.9) and observe that Lemma 3.4 tells us that the constant function $\theta = 1/2$ is in the interior of $\mathcal{P}(E_1)$. Now we are able to conclude that

$$\Lambda(f_v^0|v\in E_1) \le C\|t\|_{\dot L^2_{-\alpha}}\|q_0\|_{\dot L^2_\alpha}\prod_{j=1}^{2N}\|q_j\|_{L^2}.$$

Here we have used that $|\cdot|^{-1}$ is in the Lorentz space $L^{2,\infty}$. For the terms $\Lambda(f_v^k|v\in E_1)$, $k\ge 1$, we let $1/p_{e_0} = (1+\alpha)/2$, $1/p_{e_{2k-1}-e_{2k}} = (1-\alpha)/2$ and use Theorem 3.1 to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Lambda(f_v^k|v\in E_1)\\ &\qquad \le C\|t\|_{\dot L^2_{-\alpha}}\|q_0\|_{L^{2/(1+\alpha),2}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{2N}\|q_j\|_2\right)\||\cdot|^{\alpha-1}\|_{L^{2/(1-\alpha),\infty}}\cdot\||\cdot|^{-1}\|_{L^{2,\infty}}^{2N-1}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

The generalization of Hölder's inequality to Lorentz spaces (which may be proven by multilinear interpolation) implies that

$$\|q_0\|_{L^{2/(1+\alpha),2}} \le C\|q_0\|_{\dot L^2_\alpha}\||\cdot|^{-\alpha}\|_{L^{2/\alpha,\infty}}. \tag{3.11}$$

Since $\||\cdot|^{-\alpha}\|_{L^{2/\alpha,\infty}} \le C_\alpha$, from (3.10) and (3.11), we may conclude that

$$\Lambda(f_v^k|v\in E_1) \le C\|t\|_{\dot L^2_{-\alpha}}\|q_0\|_{\dot L^2_\alpha}\prod_{j=1}^{2N}\|q_j\|_{L^2}.$$

A similar argument replacing 0 by another even index $2k$ implies that we have the estimates

$$\Lambda_1(q_0,\ldots,q_{2N},t) \le C\|t\|_{\dot L^2_{-\alpha}}\|q_{2k}\|_{\dot L^2_\alpha}\prod_{j\ne 2k}\|q_j\|_{L^2}, \qquad k=1,\ldots,N.$$

Combining the cases $\alpha=0$ and $\alpha>0$ and multi-linear interpolation by the complex method gives the estimate (3.6). The estimate (3.7) follows directly from Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.4.

Finally, the estimate (3.8) can be obtained by beginning with the elementary estimate

$$1 \le \frac{|x_0 - x_1 + \cdots - x_{2k-1}|^\alpha + |x_{2k}|^\alpha + |x_{2k+1} - x_{2k+2}\cdots - x_{2N}|^\alpha}{|x_0 - x_1 + \cdots + x_{2N}|^\alpha}$$

and arguing as in the case of (3.6). ∎

We now turn to the estimates for the multi-linear expressions r_j defined in (1.13). Using the estimates (3.6) and (3.8) we prove the following result.

Proposition 3.12 *If $\alpha \in [0,1)$ and r_j is as defined in (1.13), then*

$$\|r_j\|_{H^{\alpha,0}} \leq C_j \|q\|^{2j+1}_{H^{0,\alpha/(j+1)}}, \tag{3.13}$$

$$\|r_j\|_{H^{0,\alpha}} \leq C_j \|q\|^{2j+1}_{H^{\alpha/(j+1),0}}. \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. Using the definition of r_j, (1.13) and the theorem of Fubini, we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}} r_j(k)t(k)\,dk = \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{2j+1}} \int_{\mathbf{C}^{2j+1}} \frac{q(y_0)\bar{q}(y_1)\dots q(y_{2j})\hat{t}(y_0 - y_1 + y_2 - \cdots + y_{2j})}{(\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_1)(y_1 - y_2)\dots(y_{2j-1} - y_{2j})}\,dy.$$

The use of Fubini can be justified since we assume that q and t are in the Schwartz class. From the above displayed equation, it is easy to see that

$$|\int_{\mathbf{C}} r_j(k)t(k)\,dk| \leq \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{2j+1}} \Lambda_1(|q|, \dots, |q|, |\hat{t}|)$$

where the form Λ_1 acts on $2j+1$ copies of $|q|$. The estimate (3.6) and duality implies that for $0 \leq \alpha < 1$,

$$\||D|^\alpha r_j\|_{L^2} \leq C(\alpha, j)\|q\|_{H^{0,\alpha/(j+1)}}.$$

Combining the cases $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ gives the estimate (3.13).

To obtain the decay of r_j in estimate (3.14), we again start with the definition of r_j in (1.13) and use (1.4) and (1.5) alternately to obtain

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}} t(k)r_j(k)\,dk = \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{2j+1}}$$
$$\times \int_{\mathbf{C}^{2j+1}} \frac{\hat{q}(k_0)\bar{\hat{q}}(k_1)\dots\hat{q}(k - k_0 + k_1 - \cdots + k_{2j-1})t(k)}{(\bar{k}_0 - \bar{k}_1)\dots(\bar{k}_0 - \bar{k}_1 + \cdots - \bar{k}_{2j-1})(k_0 - k)\dots(k_0 - k_1 + \cdots + k_{2j-2} - k)}$$
$$dk_0 \dots dk_{2j-1} dk.$$

We make the change of variables $k = k_0 - k_1 + \cdots + k_{2j}$, $dk = dk_{2j}$ and obtain

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}} t(k)r_j(k)\,dk = \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{2j+1}}$$
$$\times \int_{\mathbf{C}^{2j+1}} \frac{\hat{q}(k_0)\bar{\hat{q}}(k_1)\dots\hat{q}(k_{2j})t(k_0 - k_1 + \cdots + k_{2j})}{(\bar{k}_0 - \bar{k}_1)\dots(\bar{k}_0 - \bar{k}_1 + \cdots - \bar{k}_{2j-1})(k_{2j} - k_{2j-1})\dots(k_{2j} - k_{2j-1} + \dots k_1)} d\kappa.$$

On the right, $d\kappa = dk_0\,dk_1 \dots dk_{2j}$. Now the estimate (3.8) quickly leads to the result (3.14). ∎

4 The remainder term

The final section gives estimates for the remainder term. The moral of this section is that when $q \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ with $\epsilon > 0$, then the operator $T_k^N(\mu_1)$ becomes smoother and decays more rapidly as N increases. This allows us to estimate the remainder $r^{(N)}$ (defined in (1.14) for N large. The details are a bit tedious. We begin by listing several properties of the operator T_k that start to make the previous sentences precise.

Proposition 4.1 *Let $q \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ with $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and suppose that $\|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \leq M_0$. If $\mu_1 = \mu_1(q;\cdot,\cdot)$ is the solution constructed in Proposition 2.6, we have the following estimates for $T_k^N(\mu_1)$. Assume that p and $\tilde{p}$ are related by $1/p = 1/2 + 1/\tilde{p}$.*

a) We have $T_k^N(\mu_1) \in L^{\tilde{p}}$ if $1/\tilde{p} \in [0, \frac{\epsilon N}{2}) \cap [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and

$$\|T_k^N(\mu_1)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \leq C\|q\|^N_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}\|\mu_1\|_{L^\infty}. \tag{4.2}$$

b) For $1/\tilde{p} \in (0, 1/2)$ and $j \geq 0$, we have

$$\|T_k^{N+2j}(\mu_1)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \leq C\langle k\rangle^{-j\epsilon}\|q\|^{2j}_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}\|T_k^N(\mu_1)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}. \tag{4.3}$$

c) Provided $j \geq 0$ satisfies $j\epsilon < 2/p'$, we have the estimate

$$\|T_k^{N+j}(\mu_1)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}_{j\epsilon}} \leq C\|q\|^j_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}\|T_k^N(\mu_1)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}. \tag{4.4}$$

If in addition, $q' \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ with $\|q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \leq M_0$, we have the following estimates for differences. Given $1/\tilde{p} \in [0, 1/2)$, there exist N such that

a')

$$\|T^N_{k,q}(\mu_1(q;\cdot,k)) - T^N_{k,q'}(\mu_1(q';\cdot,k))\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \leq C(M_0)\|q - q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}.$$

b') For $1/\tilde{p}$ in $(0, 1/2)$ and $j \geq 0$, we have

$$\|T^{N+2j}_{k,q}(\mu_1(q;\cdot,k)) - T^{N+2j}_{k,q'}(\mu_1(q';\cdot,k))\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \leq C(M_0)\langle k\rangle^{-j\epsilon}\|q - q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}.$$

c') Given $\tilde{p}$ in $[2, \infty)$ and j and ϵ with $0 \leq j\epsilon < 2/p'$, we have

$$\|T^{N+j}_{k,q}(\mu_1(q;\cdot,k)) - T^{N+j}_{k,q'}(\mu_1(q';\cdot,k))\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}_{j\epsilon}} \leq C(M_0)\|q - q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}.$$

Proof. Note that by Proposition 2.9, we have that μ_1 lies in $L^\infty(\mathbf{C}^2)$. The first estimate is a consequence of the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality (2.3), the estimate (2.2), Hölder's inequality, and the observation (2.1) that $H^{\epsilon,\epsilon} \subset L^p$, if $1/p \in [1/2 - \epsilon/2, 1/2 + \epsilon/2)$. Thus the maps $f \to qf \to T_k(f)$ take $L^{\tilde{p}} \to L^t \to L^{\tilde{p}_1}$ where $1/t \in [1/\tilde{p} + 1/2 - \epsilon/2, 1/\tilde{p} + 1/2 + \epsilon/2) \cap [0, 1/2)$ and $1/\tilde{p}_1 \in [0, 1/\tilde{p} + \epsilon/2) \cap [0, 1/2)$, and

$$\|T_k(f)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}_1}} \leq C\|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}\|f\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}}.$$

Iterating this estimate gives a).

The estimate b) follows quickly from (2.5) and can be found in the work of Astala, Faraco, and Rogers [AFR15].

The third estimate (4.4) depends on the result (2.4) on fractional integration in weighted Lebesgue spaces. Using the estimate (2.4) and Hölder's inequality, the maps $f \to qf \to T_k(f)$ will map $L^{\tilde{p}}_{\alpha} \to L^{p}_{\alpha+\epsilon} \to L^{\tilde{p}}_{\alpha+\epsilon}$ where as usual $1/p = 1/\tilde{p} + 1/2$ and the second step requires the condition that $-2/\tilde{p} < \alpha + \epsilon < 2/p'$ in order to use our result on fractional integration (2.4).

The estimates for the differences follow by recognizing that each term is a multi-linear expression in several copies of q and μ_1, the continuity of μ_1 with respect to q given in Proposition 2.6 and the result of Lemma 2.8 ∎

We begin by showing that if $q \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ then given α we may choose $N = N(\alpha)$ so that $r^{(N)}$ lies in $H^{0,\alpha}$.

Lemma 4.5 *Let $q \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ with $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Given $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, there exist N such that $r^{(N)}$ lies in $H^{0,\alpha}$. If q and q' lie in $\{q \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon} : \|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \leq M_0\}$, then*

$$\|r^{(N)}\|_{H^{0,\alpha}} \leq C(M_0,\alpha) \tag{4.6}$$

$$\|r^{(N)}(q;\cdot) - r^{(N)}(q';\cdot)\|_{H^{0,\alpha}} \leq C(M_0,\alpha)\|q-q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. This is straightforward and follows an argument in Perry [Per]. Since $q \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$, according to (2.1) we have $q \in L^p$ with p defined by $1/p = 1/2 + \epsilon/4$, say. We let p' be the conjugate exponent as usual. According to parts a) and b) of Proposition 4.1, we may choose N so that

$$\|T_k^{2N}(\mu_1)\|_{L^{p'}} \leq C(M_0,\alpha)\langle k\rangle^{-2-\alpha}.$$

Thus by Hölder's inequality, we have

$$|r^{(N)}(k)| \leq \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} |e_k(x)q(x)T_k^{2N}(\mu_1)|\,dx \leq \frac{1}{\pi}\|q\|_{L^p}\|T_k^{2N}(\mu_1)\|_{L^{p'}} \leq C\langle k\rangle^{-2-\alpha}.$$

This gives the first conclusion (4.6).

To estimate the differences, we observe that $r^{(N)}$ is a multi-linear operator in q, $\bar{q}$ and μ_1 and use Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 2.6 to estimate $\mu_1(q;\cdot) - \mu_1(q';\cdot)$ in terms of $q - q'$. With these observations the continuity (4.7) follows from Lemma 2.8.

∎

We employ a similar strategy to estimate $\|r\|_{H^{\alpha,0}}$. As part of this we will need a lemma to show that $r^{(N)}$ is smooth. The proof of this result is more involved.

To estimate $r^{(N)}(k)$, we begin by computing

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial k}r^{(N)}(k) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} yq(y)e_k(y)\bar{T}_k^{2N}(\mu_1)(y)\,dy + \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)e_k(y)\frac{\partial}{\partial k}\bar{T}_k^{2N}(\mu_1)(y)\,dy.$$

Thus we need to study the expressions $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{k}} T_k^{2N}(\mu_1)$ and $\bar{y} T_k^{2N}(\mu_1)$.

Our first step is to derive an expression for the $\partial/\partial\bar{k}$-derivative of the function $T_k^{2N}(\mu_1)$. This generalizes the $\partial/\partial\bar{k}$ equation for μ_1. For this exercise, we assume that q is in the Schwartz space, which will allow us to concentrate on the formulae rather than convergence.

Lemma 4.8 *If q is in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{C})$, then*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{k}} T_k^{2N}(\mu_1) = \frac{1}{2}\bar{r}(k) T_k^{2N}(\mu_2) + \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{j=1}^{N} T_k^{2j-1}(1)\int_{\mathbf{C}} \bar{q}(x) e_k(-x) T_k^{2N-2j}(\mu_1)(x)\,dx.$$

Proof. Taking the derivative with respect to $\bar{k}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{k}} T_k^{2N}(\mu_1)(x)\\ &= T_k^{2N}(\frac{\partial \mu_1}{\partial \bar{k}})(x) + \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{j=1}^{N} T_k^{2j-1}(1)(x)\cdot\int_{\mathbf{C}} \bar{q}(x_{2j}) e_k(-x_{2j}) T_k^{2N-2j}(\mu_1)(x)\,dx_{2j}.\end{aligned}$$

If we recall the $\partial/\partial\bar{k}$-equation for μ (see Perry [Per], for example), $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{k}}\mu_1 = \frac{1}{2}\bar{r}\mu_2$, we obtain the Lemma. ▮

Lemma 4.9 *If $q \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{C})$ and $1 \le n \le N$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{x} T_k^N(f)(x)\\ &= \eta(x)(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \tilde{T}_k^{j-1}(1)(x)(\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y) e_k(y) T_k^{N-j}(f)(y)\,dy)^{*j-1} + \tilde{T}_k^{n}((\bar{\cdot}) T_k^{N-n}(f))(x)).\end{aligned}$$

Here $\eta(x) = \bar{x}/x$ and $\tilde{T}_k = T_{k,\tilde{q}}$ and $\tilde{q} = \eta q$. We use x^{*j} to denote j applications of the map $x \to \bar{x}$. Thus $x^{*j} = x$ if j is even and $x^{*j} = \bar{x}$ if j is odd.

Proof. We begin with the identity,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{x} T_k(f)(x) &= \frac{\bar{x}}{x}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y) e_k(y)\bar{f}(y)\,dy + \frac{\bar{x}}{x}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} \frac{q(y) e_k(y) y \bar{f}(y)}{x-y}\,dy\\ &= \frac{\bar{x}}{x}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y) e_k(y)\bar{f}(y)\,dy + \frac{\bar{x}}{x}\tilde{T}_k((\bar{\cdot}) f)(x).\end{aligned}$$

Iterating this result gives the Lemma. ▮

We are ready to give an estimate on the smoothness of the function $r^{(N)}$.

Lemma 4.10 *Let $q \in H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ with $\|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \leq M_0$. Then there exist $N = N(\epsilon)$ such that*

$$\|\frac{\partial}{\partial k} r^{(N)}\|_{L^2} \leq C(M_0).$$

If q, q' are both in $\{q : \|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}} \leq M_0\}$, then

$$\|\frac{\partial}{\partial k} r^{(N)}(q;\cdot) - \frac{\partial}{\partial k} r^{(N)}(q';\cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq C(M_0,\epsilon)\|q - q'\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}}.$$

Proof. We differentiate $r^{(N)}$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial k} r^{(N)}(k) &= -\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)e_k(y)y\bar{T}_k^{2N}(\mu_1)(y)\,dy + \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)e_k(y)\frac{\partial}{\partial k}\bar{T}_k^{2N}(\mu_1)(y)\,dy \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} I_j + II + \sum_{j=1}^{N} III_j + IV \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} I_j = -\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)\bar{\eta}(y)e_k(y)(\tilde{T}_k^{j-1}(1)(y))^*\,dy \\ \times \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)e_k(y)T_k^{2N-j}(\mu_1)(y)\,dy\right)^{*j} = A_jB_j \end{aligned}$$

$$II = -\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)\bar{\eta}(y)e_k(y)(\tilde{T}_k^{N}((\bar{\cdot})T_k^N(\mu_1)))^*(y)\,dy.$$

$$III_j = \frac{1}{2\pi^2}\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)e_k(y)(T_k^{2j-1}(1)(y))^*\,dy \cdot \int_{\mathbf{C}} \bar{q}(y)e_k(y)T_k^{2N-2j}(\mu_1)(y)\,dy = C_jD_j.$$

Finally, we define IV by

$$IV = \frac{1}{2\pi} r(k)\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)e_k(y)(T_k^{2N}(\mu_2)(y))^*\,dy.$$

To obtain this representation we use Lemma 4.8 and then Lemma 4.9 to commute y through N applications of T_k.

We proceed to show that each of the terms I_j, II, III_j, and IV are in L^2. To estimate the terms $I_j = A_j \cdot B_j$, we first suppose that $j \geq 3$. Then estimate (3.6) or (3.7) gives that A_j is in L^2. Since $2N - j \geq N$, we may choose N large so that part a) of Proposition 4.1 gives $T_k^{2N-j}(\mu_1) \in L^{p'}$ for $1/p' = 1/2 - \epsilon/4$, say. Since we also have $q \in L^p$, we conclude that B_j is in L^∞. For the case $j = 2$, we use Lemma 4.12 to conclude that A_2 is in L^p for some $p > 2$ while by (2.5), we may choose $N = N(\epsilon)$ so that $|B_2(k)| \leq \langle k\rangle^{-2}$ and thus the product $A_2 \cdot B_2$ is in L^2. Finally, $A_1 = \frac{1}{2}(q\bar{\eta})\hat{}$ and hence lies in L^2 by Plancherel's theorem.

For the term II, we begin by using (2.5) and Proposition 2.9 to conclude that for N large and $1/\tilde{p} = \epsilon/4$, say, that

$$\|\langle\cdot\rangle^{1-\epsilon} T_k^N(\mu_1)\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}} \leq C(\|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}})\langle k\rangle^{-2}.$$

Then since $\langle\cdot\rangle^{\epsilon} q \in L^2$, we have $\|(\bar{\cdot})qT_k^N(\mu_1)\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}})\langle k\rangle^{-2}$ for $1/p = 1/2+\epsilon/4$. Now applying $\tilde{T}_k^N$ (and possibly choosing N larger) we have $\|\tilde{T}_k^N((\bar{\cdot})T_k^N(\mu_1))\|_{L^{\tilde{p}_1}} \leq C(\|q\|_{H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}})\langle k\rangle^{-2}$ for $1/\tilde{p}_1 = 1/2 + \epsilon/4$. Then Hölder's inequality gives the estimate $|II(k)| \leq \langle k\rangle^{-2}$ and hence that II lies in L^2. A similar strategy handles the term $III_j = C_j \cdot D_j$ for $2j \leq N$. Here C_j is in L^2 by (3.6) as long as $2j \geq 4$. The estimate (4.2), estimate (2.1), and Hölder's inequality imply that D_j is bounded. When $2j = 2$, we use Lemma 4.12 and (2.5) as in the estimate for I_2.

Next we consider III_j when $2j \geq N$. Here we argue as in Lemma 4.5 to conclude that D_j is in L^2 and since $2j \geq N$, we may choose N large so that (4.2) and Hölder's inequality imply C_j is bounded.

Finally, we show the term IV is in L^2. We first recall that Astala, Faraco, and Rogers [AFR15, Theorem 3.4] show that the map $q \to \mathcal{R}(q)$ maps $H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ to L^2 and is locally Lipschitz continuous. With this result, we only need to show that the map

$$q \to \int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)e_k(y)(T_k^{2N}(\mu_2)(y))^*\,dy \tag{4.11}$$

takes $H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$ into L^∞. From the estimate (2.1), we have that $q \in L^p$ for some $p > 2$ while part a) of Proposition 4.1 and (1.7) imply that for N large, we have $T_k^{2N}(\mu_2)$ in the dual space, $L^{p'}$. It follows that $\int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)e_k(y)(T_k^{2N}(\mu_2)(y))^*\,dy$ lies in L^∞.

To complete the proof, we need to show that each of these terms is a locally Lipschitz continuous function of q. This follows from similar arguments using Proposition 4.1 a'-c') and Lemma 2.8. ∎

Lemma 4.12 *If $q \in L^{s_q}$ with $4/3 < s_q < 2$, then $r(k) = \int_{\mathbf{C}} q(y)e_k(y)T_k(1)(y)\,dy$ lies in L^{s_r} where $1/s_r = 3/2 - 2/s_q$ and we have the estimate*

$$\|r\|_{L^{s_r}} \leq C\|q\|^2_{L^{s_q}}.$$

Proof. We will estimate r by duality and thus we choose t a nice function in $L^{s_r'}$. We write

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}} t(k)r(k)\,dk = \frac{1}{2\pi^2}\int_{\mathbf{C}} \frac{\bar{q}(z)q(y)\hat{t}(y-z)}{\bar{y}-\bar{z}}\,dydz. \tag{4.13}$$

We may use the Hausdorff-Young inequality and the interpolation result of Christ [Chr85] or Janson [Jan86] to find that the right-hand side of (4.13) is finite when $2/s_q + 1/s_r = 3/2$. Note that the condition on the second index in the Lorentz spaces will always hold true since $2/s_q \geq 2$. ∎

We are ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.10.

Proof of Theorem 1.10. We write $r(k) = \mathcal{R}(q)(k) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} r_j(k) + r^{(N)}(k)$ where r_j and $r^{(N)}$ are as in (1.13) and (1.14). According to Proposition 3.12 we have r_j is in $H^{\beta,\alpha}$ if q is in $H^{\alpha,\beta}$. By Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.10, given $\epsilon > 0$, we may find $N = N(\epsilon)$ so that $r^{(N)}$ is in $H^{\beta,\alpha}$ if q is in $H^{\epsilon,\epsilon}$.

To estimate $r - \hat{q}$, we note that $r_0 = \hat{q}$ and then use Lemma 3.1 to conclude that $r_j \in H^{2\beta,2\alpha}$ when $q \in H^{\alpha,\beta}$ and $j \geq 1$. Finally, we use Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.10 to conclude that the remainder $r^{(N)}$ lies in $H^{2\beta,2\alpha}$. This gives the second estimate of the Theorem. ∎

A Appendix: The matroid polytope

Nathan Serpico
Department of Mathematics
University of Kentucky
Lexington KY 40506-0027

Russell M. Brown
Department of Mathematics
University of Kentucky
Lexington KY 40506-0027

We give the proof of Lemma 3.4 in this section. We let E denote one of the matroids E_1 or E_2 defined in section 3. Our strategy is to show that for any pair of vectors (v, w) from E, we may find two bases B_1 and B_2 so that $\{v\} = B_1 \cap B_2$ and $\{w\} = E \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)$. Since $\chi_{B_j} \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is convex, it follows that $\Phi_{v,w} = \frac{1}{2}(\chi_{B_1} + \chi_{B_2})$ lies in $\mathcal{P}(E)$. We have that

$$\Phi_{v,w}(u) = \begin{cases} 1, & u = v \\ 0, & u = w \\ 1/2, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

It is not hard to show that $\mathcal{A}$, the set in Lemma 3.4, is the convex hull of $\Phi_{v,w}$ for all pairs (v, w) from E.

We first consider the matroid E_1 with $N \geq 2$.

Lemma A.1 *Consider a pair (v, w) with elements from E_1. We may find two bases B_1 and B_2 of $\mathbf{R}^{N+1}$ so that $B_1 \cap B_2 = \{v\}$ and $E_1 \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2) = \{w\}$.*

Proof. Our proof is not particularly clever. We consider a number of cases and list the bases in each case. In several of the cases, we will make use of the map $e_k \to e_{N-k}$ which preserves the elements of E_1, at least up to a sign. This will allow us to assume that the vectors satisfy certain extra conditions. We let $S = \{e_0, e_1, \ldots, e_N\}$, $D = \{e_0 - e_1, \ldots, e_{N-1} - e_N\}$, and $\zeta = e_0 - e_1 + \cdots + (-1)^N e_N$.

Case 1: $v = e_k$ and $w = e_\ell$. In this case we may let $B_1 = (S \setminus \{e_\ell\}) \cup \{\zeta\}$ and $B_2 = D \cup \{e_k\}$.

Case 2: $v = e_k$ and $w = e_{\ell-1} - e_\ell$. We choose $\hat{e} = e_N$ if $k \leq \ell - 1$ or $\hat{e} = e_0$ if $k \geq \ell$. Then we let $B_1 = (S \cup \{\zeta\}) \setminus \{\hat{e}\}$ and $B_2 = (D \setminus \{e_{\ell-1} - e_\ell\}) \cup \{e_k, \hat{e}\}$.

Case 3: $v = e_{\ell-1} - e_\ell$ and $w = e_k$. Subcase A: $k \neq \ell - 1$ or ℓ. Then $B_1 = \{\zeta, e_{\ell-1} - e_\ell\} \cup (S \setminus \{e_k, e_{\ell-1}\})$ and let $B_2 = D \cup \{e_{\ell-1}\}$.

Subcase B: If $k = \ell - 1$ or ℓ, then choose $\hat{e} = e_m$ with $m \neq \ell - 1$ or ℓ and set $B_1 = \{\zeta, e_{\ell-1} - e_\ell\} \cup (S \setminus \{\hat{e}, e_k\})$ and $B_2 = D \cup \{\hat{e}\}$.

Case 4: $v = e_{k-1} - e_k$ and $w = e_{\ell-1} - e_\ell$. In this case we may flip the order and assume $k < \ell$ if necessary. We let $B_1 = \{\zeta, e_{k-1} - e_k\} \cup (S \setminus \{e_{k-1}, e_\ell\})$ and $B_2 = (D \setminus \{e_{\ell-1} - e_\ell\}) \cup (\{e_{k-1}, e_\ell\})$.

Case 5: $v = \zeta$ and $w = e_k$. In this case, we may assume, after possibly flipping the order of the coordinates, that $k < N - 1$, provided that $N \geq 3$. In this case, we let $B_1 = \{e_0 - e_1, \ldots, e_k - e_{k+1}, e_{k+1}, \ldots, e_{N-1}, \zeta\}$ and $B_2 = \{e_0, \ldots, e_{k-1}, e_N, e_{k+1} - e_{k+2}, \ldots, e_{N-1} - e_N, \zeta\}$. The case $k = 1$ and $N = 2$ must be handled separately and in this case we can let $B_1 = \{e_0, e_2, \zeta\}$ and $B_2 = \{e_0 - e_1, e_1 - e_2, \zeta\}$.

Case 6: $v = \zeta$ and $w = e_k - e_{k+1}$. Again, we may assume that $k < N - 1$. We let $B_1 = \{e_1, \ldots, e_{k+1}, e_{k+1} - e_{k+2}, \ldots, e_{N-1} - e_N, \zeta\}$ and $B_2 = \{e_0, e_{k+2}, \ldots, e_N, e_0 - e_1, \ldots, e_{k-1} - e_k, \zeta\}$. Again, the case $k = 1$ and $N = 2$ must be handled separately and for this case, we can let $B_1 = \{e_0, e_2, \zeta\}$ and $B_2 = \{e_1, e_0 - e_1, \zeta\}$.

Case 7: $v = e_{k-1} - e_k$ and $w = \zeta$. In this case we let $B_1 = (S \setminus \{e_k\}) \cup \{e_{k-1} - e_k\}$ and $B_2 = D \cup \{e_k\}$.

∎

We let E_2 denote the set of vectors defined for $N \geq 1$ before Lemma 3.4 and establish a similar result.

Lemma A.2 *Consider a pair of vectors (v, w) from E_2. We may find a pair of bases B_j, $j = 1, 2$ so that $B_1 \cap B_2 = \{v\}$ and $(E_2 \setminus B_1) \cap (E_2 \setminus B_2) = \{w\}$.*

Proof. Again the proof is by cases. We let $S = \{e_0, e_1, e_2, \ldots e_{2N}\}$, $D = \{e_0 - e_1, \ldots, e_0 - e_1 + \cdots - e_{2N-1}, e_{2N} - e_{2N-1}, \ldots, e_{2N} - e_{2N-1} + \cdots - e_1\}$, and set $\zeta = e_0 - e_1 + \cdots + e_{2N}$.

Case 1: $v = e_j$ and $w = e_k$. Let $B_1 = (S \setminus \{e_k\}) \cup \{\zeta\}$ and $B_2 = D \cup \{e_j\}$.

Case 2: $v = e_j$ and $w = \zeta$. Let $B_1 = S$ and $B_2 = D \cup \{e_j\}$.

Case 3: $v = \zeta$ and $w = e_j$. Let $B_1 = (S \setminus \{e_j\}) \cup \{\zeta\}$ and $B_2 = D \cup \{\zeta\}$.

Case 4: $v = e_j$ and $w = d \in D$. If necessary, we may apply the transformation, $e_k \to e_{2N-k}$ so that the vector d has the form $d = e_0 - e_1 + \cdots - e_k$. Now we choose a vector e_ℓ which depends on e_j with ℓ defined as follows:

$$e_\ell = \begin{cases} e_{2N}, & j = 0, \\ e_0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then we let the bases be $B_1 = (S \setminus \{e_\ell\}) \cup \{\zeta\}$ and $B_2 = (D \setminus \{d\}) \cup \{e_j, e_\ell\}$.

Case 5: $v = d \in D$ and $w = e_j$. We may assume that $d = e_0 - e_1 + \cdots - e_k$, as above. We choose a vector e_ℓ to be $e_\ell = e_{2N}$ if $j \leq k$ and $e_\ell = e_0$ if $j > k$. Then we put $B_1 = (S \setminus \{e_j, e_\ell\}) \cup \{\zeta, d\}$ and $B_2 = D \cup \{e_\ell\}$.

Case 6: $v = d_1 \in D$ and $w = d_2 \in D$. If necessary, we may apply the transformation, $e_j \to e_{2N-j}$ and assume that $d_2 = e_0 - e_1 + \cdots - e_k$. We put $B_1 = (S \setminus \{e_0, e_{2N}\}) \cup \{\zeta, d_1\}$ and $B_2 = (D \setminus \{d_2\}) \cup \{e_0, e_{2N}\}$.

Case 7: $v = d \in D$ and $w = \zeta$. By flipping the vectors, we may assume that $d = e_0 - \cdots - e_k$. We put $B_1 = (S \setminus \{e_k\}) \cup \{d\}$ and $B_2 = D \cup \{e_k\}$.

Case 8: $v = \zeta$ and $w = d \in D$. Again, we may assume that $d = e_0 - e_1 + \cdots - e_k$. We let $B_1 = (S \setminus \{e_k\}) \cup \{\zeta\}$ and $B_2 = (D \setminus \{d\}) \cup \{\zeta\} \cup \{e_k\}$.

∎

References

[AFR15] K. Astala, D. Faraco, and K.M. Rogers. On Plancherel's identity for a two-dimensional scattering transform. *Nonlinearity*, 28(8):2721–2729, 2015.

[Bar98] F. Barthe. On a reverse form of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality. *Invent. Math.*, 134(2):335–361, 1998.

[BBR01] J.A. Barceló, T. Barceló, and A. Ruiz. Stability of the inverse conductivity problem in the plane for less regular conductivities. *J. Differential Equations*, 173(2):231–270, 2001.

[BC88] R. Beals and R.R. Coifman. The spectral problem for the Davey-Stewartson and Ishimori hierarchies. In *Nonlinear evolution equations: Integrability and spectral methods*, pages 15–23. Manchester University Press, 1988.

[BCCT10] J. Bennett, A. Carbery, M. Christ, and T. Tao. Finite bounds for Holder-Brascamp-Lieb multilinear inequalities. *Math. Research Letters*, 17(4):647–666, July 2010.

[BL76] J. Bergh and J. Löfström. *Interpolation spaces.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1976.

[Bro01] R. M. Brown. Estimates for the scattering map associated with a two-dimensional first-order system. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 11(6):459–471, 2001.

[BU97] R.M. Brown and G.A. Uhlmann. Uniqueness in the inverse conductivity problem for nonsmooth conductivities in two dimensions. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 22(5-6):1009–1027, 1997.

[Chr85] M. Christ. On the restriction of the Fourier transform to curves: endpoint results and the degenerate case. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 287(1):223–238, 1985.

[CLL04] E. A. Carlen, E. H. Lieb, and M. Loss. A sharp analog of Young's inequality on S^N and related entropy inequalities. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 14(3):487–520, 2004.

[FA84] A.S. Fokas and M.J. Ablowitz. On the inverse scattering transform of multidimensional nonlinear equations related to first-order systems in the plane. *J. Math. Phys.*, 25:2494–2505, 1984.

[Jan86] S. Janson. On interpolation of multi-linear operators. *Function Spaces and Applications (Proceedings, Lund 1986), Lecture Notes in Math*, 1302:290–302, 1986.

[Lee04] J. Lee. *A first course in combinatorial optimization.* Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[NB11] Z. Nie and R.M. Brown. Estimates for a family of multi-linear forms. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 377(1):79–87, 2011.

[Per] P.A. Perry. Global well-posedness and large-time asymptotics for the defocussing Davey-Stewartson II equation in $H^{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^2)$. with an appendix by Michael Christ, arXiv:1110.5589v2 [math.AP], to appear in J. Spectral Theory.

[Ste70] E.M. Stein. *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions.* Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 1970.

[Sun94a] L.-Y. Sung. An inverse scattering transform for the Davey-Stewartson II equations, I. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 183:121–154, 1994.

[Sun94b] L.-Y. Sung. An inverse scattering transform for the Davey-Stewartson II equations, II. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 183:289–325, 1994.

[Sun94c] L.-Y. Sung. An inverse scattering transform for the Davey-Stewartson II equations, III. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 183:477–494, 1994.

[SW58] E. M. Stein and Guido Weiss. Fractional integrals on n-dimensional Euclidean space. *J. Math. Mech.*, 7:503–514, 1958.

[SW92] E. Sawyer and R. L. Wheeden. Weighted inequalities for fractional integrals on Euclidean and homogeneous spaces. *Amer. J. Math.*, 114(4):813–874, 1992.

[Vek62] I.N. Vekua. *Generalized Analytic functions.* Addison Wesley Pub. Co., Reading, Mass., 1962.

[Zho98] X. Zhou. L^2-Sobolev space bijectivity of the scattering and inverse scattering transforms. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 51(7):697–731, 1998.

April 8, 2016